

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXIO**

ESTHER RAQUEL MEDINA,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 1:24-cv-00337-KK

FIRST CONVENIENCE NATIONAL BANK OF TEXAS and
NATIONWIDE INSURANCE,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
GRANTING MOTION TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*,
DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff's Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Doc. 1, filed April 8, 2024 ("Complaint"), Plaintiff's Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs, Doc. 2, filed April 8, 2024, and Plaintiff's Motion for Counsel, Doc. 4, filed April 8, 2024.

Application to Proceed in forma pauperis

The statute for proceedings *in forma pauperis*, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), provides that the Court may authorize the commencement of any suit without prepayment of fees by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets the person possesses and that the person is unable to pay such fees.

When a district court receives an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, it should examine the papers and determine if the requirements of [28 U.S.C.] § 1915(a) are satisfied. If they are, leave should be granted. Thereafter, if the court finds that the allegations of poverty are untrue or that the action is frivolous or malicious, it may dismiss the case[.]

Menefee v. Werholtz, 368 Fed.Appx. 879, 884 (10th Cir. 2010) (citing *Ragan v. Cox*, 305 F.2d 58, 60 (10th Cir. 1962). “The statute [allowing a litigant to proceed *in forma pauperis*] was intended for the benefit of those too poor to pay or give security for costs....” *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 344 (1948). While a litigant need not be “absolutely destitute,” “an affidavit is sufficient which states that one cannot because of his poverty pay or give security for the costs and still be able to provide himself and dependents with the necessities of life.” *Id.* at 339.

The Court grants Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs. Plaintiff signed an affidavit stating she is unable to pay the costs of these proceedings and provided the following information: (i) Plaintiff’s average monthly income during the past 12 months is \$898.00; (ii) Plaintiff’s monthly expenses total \$298.00; (iii) Plaintiff has three children who rely on her for support; and (iv) Plaintiff has \$0.00 in cash and no funds in a bank account. The Court finds that Plaintiff is unable to pay the costs of this proceeding because Plaintiff signed an affidavit stating she is unable to pay the costs of these proceedings, because of her low monthly income, and because her three children rely on her for support.

The Complaint

Plaintiff alleges:

I was injured due to system failure as well as my children. I was given 3500 3 years later after broken patella. I am reporting fraud someone took money out my bank account 6,928

....

I was in a accident 6/16/2018. I proceeded suing them then got ambushed and embezzled out of my compensation. Fraud was committed onto my account

[sic] Complaint at 2. Where the Complaint form prompts plaintiffs to provide supporting facts and to describe how each defendant is involved, Plaintiff wrote:

Andy – Keller & Keller 6/21/2018 Alb, NM

Ron Bell 6/16/21 Alb, NM
Amanda 6/20/21 Alb, NM
Nationwide Insurance 1/2/21 Alb, NM
1st Nation bank of Texas Alb, NM

Complaint at 3. It is not clear whether Plaintiff is asserting claims against “Andy,” “Ron Bell” and “Amanda” because the Complaint does not identify them as defendants. *See* Complaint at 1-2.

As the party seeking to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court, Plaintiff bears the burden of alleging facts that support jurisdiction. *See Dutcher v. Matheson*, 733 F.3d 980, 985 (10th Cir. 2013) (“Since federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, we presume no jurisdiction exists absent an adequate showing by the party invoking federal jurisdiction”); *Evitt v. Durland*, 243 F.3d 388 *2 (10th Cir. 2000) (“even if the parties do not raise the question themselves, it is our duty to address the apparent lack of jurisdiction sua sponte”) (quoting *Tuck v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 859 F.2d 842, 843 (10th Cir.1988)).

There is no properly alleged federal-question jurisdiction because the Complaint does not allege that this action “aris[es] under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

“For a case to arise under federal law within the meaning of § 1331, the plaintiff’s well-pleaded complaint must establish one of two things: either that federal law creates the cause of action or that the plaintiff’s right to relief necessarily depends on resolution of a substantial question of federal law” . . . “The complaint must identify the statutory or constitutional provision under which the claim arises, and allege sufficient facts to show that the case is one arising under federal law.”

Davison v. Grant Thornton LLP, 582 Fed.Appx. 773, 775 (10th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Firstenberg v. City of Santa Fe*, 696 F.3d 1018, 1023 (10th Cir.2012) and *Martinez v. U.S. Olympic Committee*, 802 F.2d 1275, 1280 (10th Cir. 1986)). Although Plaintiff filed her Complaint using the form “Civil Rights Complaint Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983,” there are no factual allegations showing that this case arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

There is no properly alleged diversity jurisdiction because the Complaint states that Plaintiff and Defendants are citizens of New Mexico and does not allege that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. *See* Complaint at 1. To invoke diversity jurisdiction, “a party must show that complete diversity of citizenship exists between the adverse parties and that the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.” *Symes v. Harris*, 472 F.3d 754, 758 (10th Cir.2006). “Complete diversity is lacking when any of the plaintiffs has the same residency as even a single defendant.” *Dutcher v. Matheson*, 733 F.3d 980, 987 (10th Cir. 2013).

It appears the Court should dismiss this case because the Complaint does not show that the Court jurisdiction over this matter. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (“If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action”).

The Complaint fails to state a claim against Defendants because it does not explain what each Defendant did to Plaintiff and what specific right Plaintiff believes each Defendant violated. *See Nasious v. Two Unknown B.I.C.E. Agents, at Arapahoe County Justice Center*, 492 F.3d 1158, 1163 (10th Cir. 2007) (“[T]o state a claim in federal court, a complaint must explain what each defendant did to him or her; when the defendant did it; how the defendant’s action harmed him or her; and, what specific legal right the plaintiff believes the defendant violated.”).

The Complaint also fails to state a claim for fraud because it does not allege with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or the false representations made by each Defendant. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b) states: “In alleging fraud or mistake, a party must state with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or mistake.” Rule 9’s purpose is “to afford defendant fair notice of plaintiff’s claims and the factual ground upon which [they] are based. . . .” *United States ex rel. Lemmon v. Envirocare of Utah, Inc.*, 614 F.3d 1163, 1172 (10th Cir. 2010). “At a minimum, Rule 9(b) requires that a plaintiff set forth the ‘who, what, when,

where and how’ of the alleged fraud , . . . and must set forth the time [and date], place, and contents of the false representation, the identity of the party making the false statements and the consequences thereof.” *United States ex rel. Sikkenga v. Regence Bluecross Blueshield of Utah*, 472 F.3d 702, 726-727 (10th Cir. 2006).

The Court orders Plaintiff to show cause why the Court should not dismiss this case for lack of jurisdiction and failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. If Plaintiff asserts the Court should not dismiss this case, Plaintiff must file an amended complaint.

Service on Defendants

Section 1915 provides that the “officers of the court shall issue and serve all process, and perform all duties in [proceedings *in forma pauperis*]”). 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d). The Court will not order service of Summons and Complaint on Defendants at this time because the Court is ordering Plaintiff to file an amended complaint. The Court will order service if Plaintiff files: (i) an amended complaint that states a claim over which the Court has jurisdiction; and (ii) a motion for service which provides each Defendant’s address.

Motion to Appoint Counsel

Plaintiff’s Motion to appoint counsel states in its entirety: “Im [sic] requesting attorney.” Motion to Appoint Counsel at 1.

“[C]ivil litigants have no right to counsel.” *Witmer v. Grady County Jail*, 483 Fed.Appx. 458, 462 (10th Cir. 2012). The decision to appoint counsel is left to the “extremely broad” discretion of the district court. *Castner v. Colo. Springs Cablevision*, 979 F.2d 1417, 1420 (10th Cir. 1992). While courts have authority to “*request* an attorney to represent a litigant who is proceeding in forma pauperis,” *Johnson v. Johnson*, 466 F.3d 1213, 1217 (10th Cir. 2006) (emphasis added), the Court cannot “*require* an unwilling attorney to represent an indigent litigant

in a civil case," *Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for S. Dist. of Iowa*, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989) (emphasis added). Congress has not provided any mechanism, process, or funds to pay appointed counsel. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Thus, the Court not only considers the benefits of having a represented plaintiff, but also must consider the hardship imposed on an attorney who is appointed to serve without remuneration or compensation, as well as without assurance that he or she would have funds available to assist in the investigation of claims, conduct formal discovery, retain experts, pay witness fees, or otherwise defray the costs of litigation. Plaintiff has not cited, and the Court has not found, any legal authority which would allow the Court to appoint counsel in this case.

The Court denies Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel. The Court refers Plaintiff to the District of New Mexico's Guide for Pro Se Litigants (October 2022) which, on page 6, lists resources for legal representation.

Case Management

Generally, *pro se* litigants are held to the same standards of professional responsibility as trained attorneys. It is a *pro se* litigant's responsibility to become familiar with and to comply with the *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure* and the *Local Rules of the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico* (the "Local Rules").

Guide for Pro Se Litigants at 4, United States District Court, District of New Mexico (October 2022). The Local Rules, the Guide for Pro Se Litigants and a link to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are available on the Court's website: <http://www.nmd.uscourts.gov>.

Compliance with Rule 11

The Court reminds Plaintiff of her obligations pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Yang v. Archuleta*, 525 F.3d 925, 927 n. 1 (10th Cir. 2008) ("*Pro se* status does not excuse the obligation of any litigant to comply with the fundamental requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil and Appellate Procedure."). Rule 11(b) provides:

Representations to the Court. By presenting to the court a pleading, written motion, or other paper--whether by signing, filing, submitting, or later advocating it--an attorney or unrepresented party certifies that to the best of the person's knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances:

- (1) it is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation;
- (2) the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law or for establishing new law;
- (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and
- (4) the denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence or, if specifically so identified, are reasonably based on belief or a lack of information.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b). Failure to comply with the requirements of Rule 11 may subject Plaintiff to sanctions, including monetary penalties and nonmonetary directives. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c).

IT IS ORDERED that:

- (i) Plaintiff's Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs, Doc. 2, filed April 8, 2024, is **GRANTED**.
- (ii) Plaintiff's Motion for Counsel, Doc. 4, filed April 8, 2024, is **DENIED**.
- (iii) Plaintiff shall, within 21 days of entry of this order: (a) show cause why the Court should not dismiss this case for lack of jurisdiction and failure to state a claim; and (b) file an amended complaint. Failure to timely show cause and file an amended complaint may result in dismissal of this case.


KIRTAN KHALSA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE